



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,888	10/30/2003	Daniel R. Tretter	200314885-1	8499

22879 7590 03/18/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KRASNIC, BERNARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/18/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10696888	10/30/2003	TRETTER ET AL.	200314885-1

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BERNARD KRASNIC

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2624	20080305
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

1. The reply brief filed 1/04/2008 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.
2. The Examiner, in response to the Applicant's argument that the Examiner appears to show either a misunderstanding or mischaracterization of the claimed invention [see Reply Brief dated 1/04/2008, "The Examiner next stated that the Gibbon references ..." in pages 3-4], will briefly re-iterate the fact that the Gibbon reference [for example independent claim 1] does teach a method of displaying an image with a display device, the method comprising of receiving image data on a first type of grid; generating a first sub-frame and a second sub-frame corresponding to the image data, the first and the second sub-frames each generated on a second type of grid that is different than the first type of grid; and alternating between displaying the first sub-frame in a first position and displaying the second sub-frame in a second position spatially offset from the first position [see art rejection toward claim 1 on pages 3-4 of the Examiners Answer to Appeal Brief filed 11/05/2007]. However as the Examiner continuously expresses the Gibbon reference fails to specifically disclose one of the first type of grid and the second type of grid is a non-rectangular grid and therefore the Messing reference was used as the secondary reference to only show this limitation [as discussed in pages 3-4 and 13-15 of the Examiner's Answer to Appeal Brief]. So the point that the Applicant makes that the Examiner ignores the complexities involved in generating sub-frames for display at spatially offset positions when different types of grids are involved is untrue because as discussed in the art rejection where every claim limitation is considered, the Gibbon reference with Messing's secondary teaching (Messing is teaching that the fact that images may be on different grid patterns [rectangular and non-rectangular] is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention) that one type of grid is on a rectangular grid while the other is on a non-rectangular grid is a predictable variation of the well-known technique to derive the instant invention. The obviousness rationale advanced hereinabove [and as discussed for example to claim 1 in pages 13-15 in the Examiner's Answer to the Appeal Brief] is consistent with the criteria articulated in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007). Therefore for the reasons above and for the reasons as discussed in the Examiner's Answer to Appeal Brief, it is still believed that the rejections should be sustained.

/Jingge Wu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624